

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/601,694	ANDREASSON ET AL.	
	Examiner Edward M. Johnson	Art Unit 1754	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Edward M. Johnson. (3) _____.

(2) Christopher Lewis. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 09 September 2003.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: all pending.

Identification of prior art discussed: Alcorn '776, Frederiksen '528, Yavuz '107.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant asserted that although Alcorn contains an ambiguous disclosure regarding the location of the injection point, the totality of the reference does not suggest the claimed placement. Applicant then pointed out that Frederiksen is primarily directed to a silencer and would not have been obvious to combine with Alcorn. Applicant also noted that SCR processes are only mentioned in passing by Yavuz, which is primarily directed to an oxidation catalyst process. Therefore, Applicant asserted that Yavuz also would not have been obvious to combine with Alcorn. The Examiner assured Applicant that these arguments would be given full consideration in Applicant's next response.